

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 were in this application.

Claim 4 was amended to eliminate an improper dependence noted by the examiner.

Claim 7 was amended to recite a slot in the TV for a removable medium .

Claims 13-20 have been canceled.

For the reasons explained below, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12 is respectfully requested.

**Objection to the Specifications:**

The examiner objected to the title. A new title has been provided.

**Claim Objections:**

The examiner objected to claim 4 as being improperly dependent. This problem has been corrected by the amendment to claim 4 noted above.

**Claims Rejections under 35 USC 102:**

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent 7,216,358 (Vantalon).

Applicant's claims 1 and 2 define a television system that includes:

- a) a media encoder for an incoming video stream,
- b) a first storage to buffer the media stream,
- c) a processor to copy portions of the media stream to an interface for a removable media, and
- d) a second storage to store data received from the interface.

The first and the second storage are specifically defined as being storage for particular data. As noted below, the examiner has pointed to storage devices in the reference; however, the storage devices in the reference have entirely different functions from the storage device defined by applicant's claims.

Applicant's claims 1 and 2 specifically call for:

“a first storage location coupled to the media encoder and structured to buffer an encoded media stream”

“a processor structured to generate signals to copy portions of the buffered media stream to an interface for removable media”; and

“a second storage location structured to store encoded data retrieved from the interface”

Thus, applicant's claim specifically calls for copying portions of the media stream to an interface that then transferring data from the interface to the second storage location.

The examiner indicates that the Vantalon reference shows a first storage location 46 and a second storage location 36. It is certainly true that the Vantalon reference shows storage locations 46 and 36: however, these storage locations do not store the data that is specifically specified in applicant's claims.

As shown in Vantalon's Figure 4, the buffer 46 provides data to the “Out-of Band Channel Encoder” 45.

At column 7 lines 2 et seq., Vantalon indicated that “out-of –band channel decoder 41..... receives the out-of-band signal OBin from the out-of-band receiver 31 shown in Figure 4. It is noted that the “in-Band Receiver” 30 shown in the Vantalon reference is the receiver that received the “media stream”.

In summary, both memories recited in applicant's claims store data from the media stream. In the Vantalon reference memory 36 does store data from the media stream; however, memory 46 only stores out-of-band data. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 2 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 USC 103:**

**Claims 3, 4, 5-6 and 9-12** were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Hong (US 2002/0039245).

Claims 3, 4, 5-6 and 9-12 are all dependent upon claim 1 and hence they include the limitations in claim 1 discussed above.

The above discussion of the Vantalon reference is relevant to this rejection and it is incorporated herein by reference.

The examiner indicates that Hong discloses an interface structured to hold more than one removable media. Such a disclosure in no way eliminates the deficiency in the Vantalon reference that was discussed above.

Thus, reconsideration and allowance of claims 3, 4, 5-6 and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

**Claims 7-8, 13-15 and 18-19** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Bezzant (US 6,104,7170).

It is noted that claims 13-20 have been canceled; hence only claims 7-8 will be discussed.

It is noted that claim 7 has been amended so that the claim now calls for a "Television (TV) comprising". This change has been made to emphasize the fact that the system shown in applicant's specification is a unitary television and not just a recorder.

Claim 7 was also amended to specifically recite "a slot in said TV". This change was made to make clear that the recordable medium is inserted in a slot in the TV itself and not in a separate recording unit.

Claim 7 also calls for:

“a controller coupled to the media encoder and to the storage location, the controller structured to accept a command from the media encoder after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location”

It is important to note that the claim specifically calls for a controller that accepts “a command from the media encoder **after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location**” (emphasis added).

The examiner equates the Conditional Access Module (CAM) 17 shown in the Vantalon reference to the encoder specified in applicants claim.

As indicated in Vantalon’s Figure 4, it is clear that the Conditional Access Module 17 only receives signals from the “in Band Receiver 30 and from the Out of Band Receiver 31.

The examiner equates the storage location recited in claim 7 to the storage location 46 shown in Vantalon. The output of the memory 46 goes to the “Out of Band Channel Encoder” 45 as shown in Vantalon’s Figure 6.

The examiner cites column 7, lines 16 and 17 of Vantalon as showing the function of storage module 46. At column 7 lines 18 et seq., the Vantalon reference states:

The transmit buffer 46 is emptied by channel encoder 45 and is transmitted by way of out-of-band transmitter 32 to the cable head end”

In contrast to the above, applicants claim 7 calls for:

“a controller coupled to the media encoder and to the storage location, the controller structured to accept a command from the media encoder after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location” and

“a processor structured to generate signals to copy portions of the buffered media stream to the interface when removable media is coupled to the interface”.

In summary, applicant's claim specifies that the controller sends data from the storage location to the interface for the removable media, whereas, in Vantalon, the data from the storage is sent to the "cable head end".

Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 7 and hence the above discussion of claim 7 applies equally to claim 7.

Since the references do not show or suggest a system such as that defined by applicant's claims, reconsideration and allowance of claims 7 and 8 is respectfully requested.

In conclusion: for the foregoing reasons, allowance of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 20575**

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



---

Elmer W. Galbi  
Reg. No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613  
E-mail: [elmer@techlaw.com](mailto:elmer@techlaw.com)